| Case | 2:24-cv-03265-SB-SSC  | Document 21<br>#:91                     | Filed 10/22/24 | Page 1 of 11 Page | ID |
|------|---|---|----------------|-------------------|----|
| 1    |   |   |                |                   |    |
| 2    |   |   |                |                   |    |
| 3    |   |   |                |                   |    |
| 4    |   |   |                |                   |    |
| 5    | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |   |                |                   |    |
| 6    | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |   |                |                   |    |
| 7    | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |   |                |                   |    |
| 8    | ALEXANDRA RASEY–SM  | ITH , et al.                            | Case No. 2:24_ | cv-03265-SB-SSC   |    |
| 9    | Plaintiff(s)  |   |                |                   |    |
| 10   | v. MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE (MSC) ORDER  |   |                |                   |    |
| 11   | CITY OF LOS ANGELES, e  | F LOS ANGELES, et al. [Updated 03/1/24] |                |                   |    |
| 12   | Defendant(s   | s).                                     | Date:          | November 15, 2024 |    |
| 13   |   |   | Time:          | 8:30 a.m.         |    |
| 14   |   |   | Courtroom:     | 6C                |    |
| 15   |   |   |                |                   |    |
| 16   | READ THIS ORDER CAREFULLY BECAUSE IT CONTROLS THIS CASE<br>AND DIFFERS IN PART FROM THE LOCAL RULES. FAILURE TO |   |                |                   |    |
| 17   | COMPLY MAY RESULT IN SANCTIONS  |   |                |                   |    |
| 18   | This case has been assigned to Judge Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr. and is set for a                                   |   |                |                   |    |
| 19   | scheduling conference pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b) on the above date in                                    |   |                |                   |    |
| 20   | Courtroom 6C of the First Street Courthouse, 350 West First Street, Los Angeles,                                |   |                |                   |    |
| 21   | CA, 90012.  |   |                |                   |    |
| 22   |   | TADIE                                   | OF COMPENI     | DC.               |    |
| 23   | TABLE OF CONTENTS   |   |                |                   |    |
| 24   | 1. <u>Preliminary Matters</u>   |   |                |                   |    |
| 25   | 2. <u>Mandatory Scheduling Conference (MSC)</u>   |   |                |                   |    |
| 26   | 3. Joint 26(f) Report   |   |                |                   |    |
| 27   | 4. Case Management Order (CMO)  |   |                |                   |    |
| 28   |   |   |                |                   |    |
|      |   |   |                |                   | I  |

1. PRELIMINARY MATTERS 92

a. Self-Represented Parties. Parties appearing pro se must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules. See L.R. 1-3, 83-2.2.3. "Counsel," as used in this order, includes parties appearing pro se.

- **b. Notice to be Provided by Counsel**. The plaintiff's counsel or, if the plaintiff is appearing pro se, defense counsel, shall provide this Order to all known parties who have not yet appeared or who appear after the date of this Order.
- c. Court's Website. This and all other applicable standing orders in this case are available on Judge Blumenfeld's webpage (<a href="https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-stanley-blumenfeld-jr">https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/honorable-stanley-blumenfeld-jr</a>). The Local Rules are available on the Central District of California website (<a href="https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/court-procedures/local-rules">https://www.cacd.uscourts.gov/court-procedures/local-rules</a>).
- d. Pleadings. If the plaintiff has not previously served the operative complaint on all defendants, the plaintiff shall promptly do so and file proof(s) of serve and file a responsive pleading and file proof of service within 3 days thereafter. At the scheduling conference, the Court will set a deadline—usually within approximately 60 days—for hearing motions to amend the pleadings or add parties (including Doe defendants).
- e. Disclosures and Discovery. The parties are reminded of their obligations to (i) confer on a discovery plan at least 21 days before the scheduling conference and (ii) make initial disclosures within 14 days after the parties' Rule 26(f) conference. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(C) & (f). The Court encourages counsel to agree to make their initial disclosures and commence discovery *before* the scheduling conference, because the Court will impose strict deadlines to complete discovery in the case management order.

## 2. MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE (MSC)

- a. Continuance. A request to continue the scheduling conference will be granted only for good cause. The parties should plant to file the joint Rule 26(f) report on the original due date even if a continuance of the MSC is granted. The Court will not continue the MSC to allow the parties to explore settlement.
- b. Participation. Lead trial counsel must attend the scheduling conference, unless excused by the Court for good cause shown in a declaration attached to the report. The Court often explores factual and legal issues at the MSC, and counsel should be prepared to address all aspects of the case.
- c. Remote Appearances. Remote appearances are not permitted except for good cause shown in a declaration attached to the report. Instructions for remote appearance can be found on Judge Blumenfeld's webpage. Counsel appearing remotely are responsible for ensuring that their equipment and the internet connection in the location from which they will be participating are reliable and adequate for uninterrupted video participation.

## 3. **JOINT RULE 26(F) REPORT**

- **a. Due Date**. File the joint Rule 26(f) report *no later than* <u>10 days</u> before the scheduling conference. An order to show cause will issue if the report is not timely filed.
- **b. Jointly Filed**. The plaintiff shall draft the report–unless the plaintiff is self-represented and not a lawyer or the parties agree otherwise–but it shall be jointly signed and filed (i.e., a single report submitted by all parties).
- **c. Format and Contents**. The Court requires strict compliance with its requirements for both the format and contents of the report. Under the

Case 2:24-cv-03265-SB-SSC Document 21 Filed 10/22/24 Page 8 of 11 Page ID disputes, complex scientific issues for the bench, etc.). 1 b. Manual for Complex Litigation Procedures. Whether these 2 procedures should be used in whole or part. 3 c. Other Issues. A statement of any other issues affecting case 4 management—e.g., unusually complex technical issues, 5 discovery in foreign jurisdiction(s), protective-order disputes, 6 accommodation needs (interpreters, ADA requests, etc.), and 7 any proposed ordering of proof (severance, bifurcation, etc.). 8 d. **ERISA Cases Involving Benefit Claims**. The parties need not file 9 a joint Rule 26(f) report. Instead, they shall file a joint report that sets 10 forth: (1) the facts and legal issues in the case; (2) the status of settlement 11 discussions and the selected form of alternative dispute resolution 12 (ADR-1, ADR-2, or ADR-3); and (3) any special issues that should be 13 considered. The parties should proceed with the preparation of the 14 administrative record and briefing without delay upon service of the 15 complaint. A court trial, ordinarily limited to oral argument on the 16 administrative record, will be scheduled within six months from the filing 17 18 of the original complaint, unless good cause for additional time is shown in the status report. If the Court concludes that the decision would not 19 benefit from oral argument, the matter may be submitted for decision on 20 21 the papers. 4. CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER (CMO) 22 **Continuances**. The CMO deadlines will *not* be continued absent a 23 a. 24

a. Continuances. The CMO deadlines will *not* be continued absent a *timely* showing of *good cause* presented in a Word document along with a proposed order delivered to Judge Blumenfeld's email (SB\_Chambers@cacd.uscourts.gov). The Court applies the same standard of good cause to all extension requests—whether opposed, unopposed or jointly requested.

25

26

27

28

- (1) Good cause. Good cause requires a specific, detailed, and non-conclusory showing of diligence from the outset of the case, describing: (1) all relevant work previously done (including when each item was completed), (2) all relevant work that remains to be done, (3) why the remaining work could not previously have been done (including efforts made to complete each remaining item), and (4) why the amount of time requested is needed to complete the remaining work. This information *must* be provided in table form contained in the attachment to the CMO.
- (2) Diligence. Diligence generally will not be found when a party opts for strategic staging of discovery (or other tasks) or for in-person deposition that prevents completion within the existing deadline. The parties should plan to complete discovery far enough in advance of the discovery deadline to allow for both the filing of a discovery motion if necessary and the completion of any court-ordered discovery. Moreover, a desire to engage in settlement discussions generally does not constitute good cause to extend discovery deadlines. The parties are strongly encouraged to agree to exchange initial disclosures promptly and to actively commence discovery before the MSC.
- (3) Proposed Order. The parties must complete and submit the CMO Extension Order Template on Judge Blumenfeld's webpage under "Orders & Additional Documents" at the bottom of the webpage.

  Please follow the highlighted directions at the end of the document.

  File the Proposed Order and submit an electronic Word copy to Judge Blumenfeld's Chambers email. Failure to use and properly submit the CMO Extension template will result in the striking or summary denial of the request.

(4) Denied with Prejudice. Denial of an extension request, including summary denial, is with prejudice. The parties should therefore present all available information showing that the outstanding discovery or other litigation tasks cannot be completed within the existing deadlines despite all reasonable diligence from the outset of the case. A party is not permitted to resubmit a denied extension request with information that was either previously submitted or previously available.

\* \* \*

Failure to comply with the procedural requirements above—including the use and proper submission of the table in the attachment to the CMO and the CMO Extension template—may result in the extension request being stricken or summarily denied. An improper resubmission of a denied extension request may result in sanctions.

- Motion Deadlines. All hearing deadlines reflect the last day when a motion may be heard, and a hearing must be set on an open hearing date. Hearing dates are closed at least four weeks in advance and may be closed earlier depending on the volume of motions scheduled.
  Consult JudgeBlumenfeld's webpage before scheduling a hearing to determine availability. A party that waits until the last day to have a motion heard risks having the motion stricken and deemed untimely if the motion is set on a date that turns out to be unavailable or is otherwise deficient. Do not wait until the last minute to file.
- c. Juvenile Records. If the parties intend to seek juvenile court records related to this case, they shall take steps *immediately* to obtain them including filing any petition or application in the relevant court. The failure to take immediate action will be considered a lack of diligence and likely will result in the denial of a request to extend a deadline based

| Case 2 | 224-cv-03265-SB-SSC Document 21 Filed 10/22/24 Page 11 of 11 Page ID                |  |  |  |  |
|--------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1      | on the need for juvenile records. To the extent that the parties seek               |  |  |  |  |
| 2      | additional time for discovery because of the asserted need for juvenile             |  |  |  |  |
| 3      | records, they shall provide a table in the joint Rule 26(f) report                  |  |  |  |  |
| 4      | identifying each allegation in the complaint that requires discovery of             |  |  |  |  |
| 5      | juvenile records, and for each such allegation they shall (a) identify the          |  |  |  |  |
| 6      | relevant juvenile records, (b) describe the relevance of the juvenile               |  |  |  |  |
| 7      | records to the allegation (and to the related claim or defense), and                |  |  |  |  |
| 8      | (c) state and explain whether (and the extent to which) the parties can             |  |  |  |  |
| 9      | obtain discovery about the allegation by means other than a review of the           |  |  |  |  |
| 10     | juvenile records. Absent a sufficient showing of need, the parties                  |  |  |  |  |
| 11     | should not expect additional time to complete discovery because of a                |  |  |  |  |
| 12     | purported need for juvenile records. An incomplete table, or conclusory             |  |  |  |  |
| 13     | assertions of need, shall be deemed insufficient. The parties act at their          |  |  |  |  |
| 14     | peril if they elect to delay taking discovery until they receive juvenile           |  |  |  |  |
| 15     | records when they reasonably could be expected to do otherwise.                     |  |  |  |  |
| 16     | <b>d. Protective Orders</b> . If the parties believe that the production of certain |  |  |  |  |
| 17     | evidence in this case requires a protective order, they shall promptly take         |  |  |  |  |
| 18     | steps to agree on appropriate terms or, if necessary, seek relief from the          |  |  |  |  |
| 19     | magistrate judge. The parties should not expect the Court to find that              |  |  |  |  |
| 20     | they have been diligent or to allow additional time to complete discovery           |  |  |  |  |
| 21     | if they delay obtaining a protective order and then wait to seek or                 |  |  |  |  |
| 22     | produce discovery until the protective order is in place.                           |  |  |  |  |
| 23     |   |  |  |  |  |
| 24     |   |  |  |  |  |
| 25     | OPER  |  |  |  |  |
| 26     | Date: October 22, 2024  |  |  |  |  |
| 27     | Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.<br>United States District Judge                             |  |  |  |  |
|        |   |  |  |  |  |